DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 647 EA 005 622

AUTHOR	Stemnock, Suzanne K.
TITLE	Systematic Rotation of Principals Among Schools. An ERS Information Aid.
INSTITUTION	Educational Research Service, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 73
NOTE	10p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Educational Research Service, Inc., 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, VA 22209 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Board of Education Policy; Elementary Schools; Information Dissemination; Literature Reviews; *Principals; *Public School Systems; *Rotation Plans; Secondary Schools; *Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Principal Welfare

ABSTRACT

Although the practice of rotating principals among schools (i.e., systematically reassigning principals among schools on a regular basis) has been the subject of much rhetoric, a sparsity of research on this subject has been reported in the literature. Consequently, in a 1973 survey of the 585 school systems in the nation enrolling 12,000 or more pupils and a selected sample of 201 smaller school systems, a question was included to discover if a school district had a procedure that calls for the systematic rotation of principals among schools on a regular basis. Copies of available policies or guidelines governing the rotation procedures also were requested. Replies were received from 468 of the 786 systems, and the statements of all the respondents to the inquiry favored the systematic rotation of principals and centered around the phrase "for the professional improvement of the principal." The rotation of principals initially was reported by 25 of the respondents; however, in a followup mailing to the 25 school systems, three reported that their replies had been in error, two indicated that their rotation systems rarely were used, and five did not respond. The remaining 15 school systems responded affirmatively to both the inquiry and the followup mailing. This publication is based on the 15 affirmative responses, on information from selected journal articles, and a study completed by the Minneapolis Public Schools. (Author/EA)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084647

ERS INFORMATION AID

Educational Research Service, Inc., 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22209

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

November 1973

SYSTEMATIC ROTATION OF PRINCIPALS AMONG SCHOOLS

Although the practice of rotating principals among schools (i.e., systematically reassigning principals among schools on a regular basis) has been the subject of much rhetoric, a sparsity of research on this subject has been reported in the literature. Consequently, Educational Research Service included the following question in a 1973 survey of (1) the 585 school systems in the nation enrolling 12,000 or more pupils and (2) a selected sample of 201 smaller school systems:

> Does your school system have a procedure which calls for the systematic rotation of principals among schools on a regular basis?

Copies of available policies or guidelines governing the rotation procedures also were requested.

Replies were received from 468 of the 786 systems--a 60 percent return. (From the larger school systems came 352 replies, or 75 percent of the total response, while 116 responses cam from smaller school systems).

The rotation of principals initially was reported by 25 of the respondents; however, in a follow-up mailing to the 25 school systems, three reported that their replies had been in error, two indicated that their rotation systems rarely were used, and five did not respond. The remaining 15 school systems responding affirmatively to both the ERS inquiry and follow-up mailing constitute .03 percent of the total responses and .01 percent of the field surveyed.

This *Information Aid* is based on the 15 affirmative responses and on information from selected journal articles and a study completed by the Minneapolis Public Schools.

Rationales for and against the systematic rotation of principals. A rationale for the rotation of principals has been stated by Leonard Kraft as follows:

1. Principals, like teachers, may fall into a routine.
2. Principals, like teachers, may reach a plateau in their contribution to their particular role in a particular situation.
3. The anxiety the individual has may be replaced by assurance.
4. Anxiety is important to all learning experience.
5. Success may be a deterrent to individual growth.
6. An individual may, after a period of time, feel that things have become humdrum in his position. Crystallization of the individual's behavior may take place.
7. Each year may become a repetition of the former year--several years in the same principalship may not really be several years of experience.[1]

Kraft offers examples from government, business, the military, and the entertainment fields to support a system of rotation of principals.

The statements of all the respondents to the ERS inquiry favor the systematic rotation of principals and center around the phrase "for the professional improvement of the principal." More colloquially, the reasons cited by respondents included "to stir up the blood," to "recharge their

[1] Kraft, Leonard. "The Rotating Principalship." *The Clearing House* 41: 462-64: April 1967.

EA 005 853

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Educational Research Service
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

batteries," and "to place old horses in new pastures." The respondent in a system that has rotated principals for many years said it is done "to avoid the establishment of little empires." Another said the reason his system rotated principals was for "effectiveness." "Either they have, we feel, used up their effectiveness in the unit in which they are assigned, or they have instituted such a fine program that we want similar leadership available in the new assignment."

A memorandum from the superintendent in Grossmont Union High School District (California) explains the strengths of a rotation policy in the following statements:

> *Professional growth*. The principals we now have in our district have served with distinction and honor. Each has his own individual strengths which have greatly added to the educational balance of our district. But the greatest service to our district is performed when these individual strengths are shared with more than one school. Working with new faculties, solving new problems, and operating under varying conditions will stimulate the professional growth of the principal. And working under varying leadership will benefit the individual teacher.
>
> *[illegible] of new forces by change*. Innovation is often the response to new challenges. Any [illegible]ual will tend to stay with those methods which have proven successful. On a short term [illegible]sis, this leads to smooth and efficient leadership. But over a long period, when conditions do not change, when only the same problems crop up each year, when the same solutions seem always the best, efficiency may turn to stagnation. It is this which the new policy seeks to prevent.

Another reason offered by the respondent in Vallejo (California) is:

> As an urban center, we have some schools which people consider "good" schools and others which people consider "bad." We believe that both teachers and principals profit from being required to change school communitites on occasion. We believe it tends to avoid "getting into a rut." More importantly, it does provide us with a balanced staff for all elementary schools. In other words, all of the beginning teachers do not wind up in the "bad" schools.

Arguments against the systematic rotation of principals were revealed in the follow-up response from Edina, Minnesota, which indicated that it recently stopped applying its policy of systematic rotation of principals although it has not completely abandoned the practice, "particularly in cases where principals might be more productive dealing with a different staff and community composition." The superintendent of Edina stated his system's position as follows:

> We have found the advantages gained from rotating principals, i.e. dealing with different pressure groups within the new neighborhood, variances among staff programs in operation, can all be accomplished by collegial inservicing. We have found, however, that we lost some home identification with the school. Frequently, children are more aware of the principal's name, if he has been there for several years, than they are of any one teacher. The principal's knowledge of the family, of an older brother or sister, tends to create a very strong home-school tie. I believe the children unconsciously, in this situation, perceive the school as an extension of home and not a separate entity. Therefore, we have noticed a greater feeling of belonging on the part of the students in schools where principals have served for several years versus those where they have continually moved. Additionally, respect toward the school property within the staff members tends to be on a higher plateau.

In reply to a 1963 *Nation's Schools* poll[2] of administrators' opinions, the following arguments against the rotation of principals were registered by 73 percent of the superintendents with reference to elementary school principals and by 79 percent of the superintendents with reference to secondary school principals:

- Whatever gains might be made by rotation would be lost because of lack of continuity within the overall program.
- Stability comes from having a general plan and seeing it through. If a principal is a professional he will not allow himself to become "stale."

---

[2]Nation's Schools. "School Principals Should Stay Put; Administrators Balk at 'Rotation.'" *Nation's Schools* 71: 85; May 1963.

- Rotation makes it impossible to establish and keep up personal relationships which are beneficial in child education.
- The principal, in order to function as the educational leader of his school, can best improve the quality of instruction by a thorough knowledge of his teachers' capabilities and their performance. New ideas often take years to implement and perfect, and rotation would reduce their chances to carry through to success.

Educators responding to a 1965 Minneapolis survey[3] based their comments, both pro and con, not so much on the concept of "rotation" but on the term "systematic." The majority of the individuals responding regarded it desirable to have the prerogative of rotating principals as needed, but opposed making it mandatory at predetermined intervals. They observed that some of the resulting problems might include a mismatch of the talents of a principal to the needs of a school; the disruption of a good working relationship with students, staff, and community with the result that successful instructional programs would suffer; the danger of uprooting a principal only a year or two before retirement; the confusion that might result in school policies under a new principal, or in the attempt to avoid such confusion, the over-centralization of policies and procedures thus suppressing creativity on the part of the building administrator; using rotation as a device to ignore a problem in a school or the incompetency of an administrator; the inability to rotate high school principals in all but the larger systems, thus giving elementary principals the feeling that they are being discriminated against; or, rotating principals among levels, with the possibility of placing a principal on a level for which he is not trained.

Levels of principals rotated. Table A, on page 4, tabulates the ERS information received from each system with regard to the levels of principals rotated. With the exceptions of the two systems that operate secondary schools only, and two systems that rotate principals on all instructional levels, the majority of respondents concentrate the rotation of principals at the elementary school level.

It is evident that, except in the very large school districts, there are too few secondary principals to facilitate rotation on the same instructional level. A possible alternative for such school systems is to follow the practice in the Grossmont Union High School District which does not limit the rotation of principals to lateral assignments. According to Grossmont's policy, the rotation of assignments "is applicable to all levels of the administrative staff" with the exception of positions that require highly specialized competencies or extensive administrative experience. The policy specifies four options for principals:

1. Assumption of a district-level position
2. Acceptance of a new position
3. Assignment to another school
4. A one-year inservice experience

Reassignments for the district's vice-principals are normally limited to rotations to new sites, as is the case in the Vallejo (California) school district.

---

[3] Minneapolis Public Schools, Department of Elementary Education. *Report of A Survey of the Ideas of 23 Recognized Leaders in Education Relative to the Systematic Rotation of Principals.* Minneapolis, Minn: Public Schools, February 1966. 17 p. Mimeographed.

Table A

15 SCHOOL SYSTEMS THAT ROTATE PRINCIPALS ON A REGULAR BASIS, 1973

School systems and 1971-72 enrollments	Level of principals rotated	Frequency of rotation	Board policy?
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA[1] (32,896)	Elementary, typically; junior high this year for the first time	Seven years	Yes
BALDWIN PARK, CALIF. (12,635)	Elementary	Five years	Yes*
CHULA VISTA, CALIF.--Elementary School District (16,644)	Elementary	Seven or eight years	No
GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIF. (La Mesa) (29,251)	Secondary; central office personnel also subject to rotation within the central office or to short-term assignments in schools	As needed, but not more often than every five years	Yes*
VALLEJO, CALIF. (16,357)	Elementary	Seven years	No[2]
VENTURA, CALIF. (18,272)	Elementary	Six or seven years	No reply
WHITTIER CALIF.--Union High School District (14,150)	Secondary	At discretion of superintendent	Yes*
DULUTH, MINN. (22,660)	Elementary	Five years	No reply
CLARK COUNTY, NEV. (Las Vegas) (74,747)	Elementary, junior, and senior high principals and assistant principals	Five to seven years	Yes*
WILLINGBORO, N. J. (14,647)	Elementary, junior, and senior high	Three to five years	Yes*
EUGENE, OREG. (20,553)	Elementary and junior high	Ten years	No reply
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH (32,221)	Elementary primarily; some in junior high schools	Seven years	Yes
EVERETT, WASH. (12,217)	Elementary and middle schools	Five years, approximately	No reply
SHORELINE SCHOOL DISTRICT, WASH. (Seattle) (15,431)	Elementary, primarily; some at junior high level	Seven to nine years	No reply
SPOKANE, WASH. (34,181)	Elementary	Seven years	No reply

[1]ANCHORAGE, ALASKA: This information is based on board policy applying to principals. A separate negotiation agreement includes a statement that reads, "As a routine procedure, each teacher and assistant principal after five (5) consecutive years in the same school unit will be subject to review and consideration for reassignment to another unit if such is deemed by the superintendent to be in the best interests of the District and the instructional program. Any transfer to a similar position will be made without loss in basic salary."

[2]VALLEJO, CALIF.: The district has a written policy which applies to elementary school teachers stating that elementary teachers will not normally serve more than seven years in any one school. This policy also has been applied to principals.

*Policy reproduced in section beginning on page 8.

Frequency of rotation. According to the policies and guidelines submitted by the 15 responding school systems, the most frequently invoked interval for rotation is seven years. (Suggestions from the literature range from three years[4] to 12 years[5] as minimum periods between rotations.) Most of the respondents' policies that include a rigid time limit contain statements allowing exceptions, such as not within two years of retirement, or except when, in the judgement of the superintendent, the best interests of the school and its community would not be served by a transfer of its principal.

Criteria used to determine assignments in rotation. All of the statements submitted to ERS regarding the criteria used in determining the rotation on principals to new assignments focus on the strengths of the particular administrator and the needs of a particular school. Among the specific criteria listed were:

1. Number of years at present school
2. Size of school
3. Previous experience of principal
4. Socio-economic nature of community
5. Need for special strengths in special situations
6. The teacher turnover in present school
7. Effectiveness in current assignment

Also noted by the respondents was the recognition of the principal's need for new experience in assignments not previously encountered.

Regarding effectiveness in current assignment, two systems, Anchorage (Alaska) and Grossmont Union High School District (California) indicated that a formal evaluation is made prior to determining the desirability of a principal's rotation. In the Grossmont district, this involves both peer and self evaluation.

Effect of rotation on salaries. In one of the 15 systems the rotation to a smaller school has an effect on the salary received: a principal moved from a larger school to a smaller school is paid the amount designated for the smaller school. Another system reported that rotation to a larger school meant an increase in salary. In the remaining systems, the salary schedules do not include factors for size of school.

Effect of rotation on other personnel policies. Other personnel policies that might be affected by a rotation policy are the participation of teachers in the selection of principals and the right of teachers to request a voluntary transfer if they feel they cannot work under the incoming principal. The Grossmont Union High School District policy addresses both of these problems. With regard to teacher participation in the rotation process, it is the policy that the incoming principal is not a new employee, is not receiving a "promotion," and therefore his rotation is not subject to teacher input. The matter concerning teacher requests for transfer as the result of principal rotation is one which Grossmont views as unaffected by the rotation policy. Requests for teacher transfers are handled on the same basis for all teachers; only if there is a vacancy in in the receiving school will a teacher be transferred. Otherwise, the teachers remain at the same school.

---

[4] Nations's Schools. "Don't Let Principals Sit Out Tenure in One Place, Say Two Districts." *Nations's Schools* 74: 31, 52; July 1964.

[5] Nations's Schools, May 1963, *op. cit.*

Reactions to rotation of principals from responding systems. The reactions of all responding central office personnel were positive toward the rotation of principals. They reported that their respective rotation systems are achieving their stated purposes. Moreover, the central office personnel endorsed the freedom of transferring a principal with a minimum of difficulty.

The perceptions of principals, teachers, and communities have been diverse, as the following comments from respondents indicate:

- This policy has been in effect for more than 10 years and no one has suggested that it be changed. I believe that it is the general assessment of everyone concerned that it is a successful program. In fact, my observation indicates that it is better accepted by the teachers than by the principals.
- I do not believe that it has any effect on the majority of our principals as they are fairly secure and stable individuals. We do have some, however, who are not quite sure of themselves as they might be and, of course, the effect of possible rotation involuntarily does make them feel rather apprehensive. I would say in general, our principals accept it, and some actively dislike it.
- The principals welcome the change. Some request changes in advance.
- A number of principals have indicated to me personally that after eight to ten years in a building they tended to "grow stale," but that the experience of moving to a new school "recharged their batteries."
- We have actually no consistent survey to determine the effect of our rotation except from general comments from principals. These comments are usually good after the first year. The first year it is difficult for some principals to make the adjustment. So far the principals have been supportive of our approach. We have had different staffs that were upset because of the changes but this also has settled down after the first year.
- Since the rotation of principals and district administrators has become a basic policy of the school district, it has attracted the attention of some administrators, particularly the assistant principals of our high schools. They perceive the broadening effect of a proper rotation and are asking to be given the opportunity to change schools for this purpose. If this policy is sensitively handled, it is my perception that the staff will welcome it.
- Every principal we have rotated has indicated to us that it has been one of the better experiences in his career. Although they often enter it with some degree of concern, shortly after having moved they have felt appreciative of the opportunity to be working with a new staff, in a new setting, and with a new community. From the comments and observed productivity, we do feel that rotation is achieving its purpose. When a person moves in our district it is not viewed as a punitive or corrective situation but one of professional growth. This is not to say, however, that we don't move people, teachers or principals, when we feel they could be more effective in another situation; but we do move others on a regular enough basis so that movement is not a stigma or something to be ashamed of.

Considerations in establishing a rotation system. Issues to be faced in considering a rotation system include frequency of rotation, salary considerations, competencies of the individual, and criteria for determing rotation assignments. Among the suggestions offered by respondents to the Minneapolis survey are:

1. Avoid any stigma attached to rotation.
2. Define the role of the principal in determining his rotation assignment.
3. Allow for exceptions--pending retirement, turnover and morale in the school staff, health problems.
4. Develop a sound rationale and a rotation policy that will withstand "ventilating."
5. Assure that administrators new to the district know and understand the policy.
6. Provide for orientation to new positions.
7. Allow teachers to apply for voluntary transfers, providing bumping rights are not allowed.
8. Maintain current salary regardless of the size of school to which assigned.
9. Stagger the rotations so that all principals do not move at once.
10. Consider rotating administrators to jobs other than the principalship.
11. Avoid cross-level rotation.
12. Make sure the policy allows the superintendent to deviate from it at his discretion.
13. Conduct a thorough investigation of the performance and status of the principals in the district as a whole, as well as individual evaluations of the principals to be affected, before making any rotation assignments.

Sample board policies and administrative regulations

On pages 8-10 are reproduced several samples of mandatory and discretionary board policies and regulations received in response to the ERS inquiry.

8

EX 1

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION: Rotation of Administrators

A. Purpose and Scope. This procedure sets forth the guidelines for implementing the rotation of assignments for administrators of the Grossmont Union High School District. It is the intent of this procedure to provide administrators an opportunity for professional growth and revitalization. The district is committed to local school autonomy and recognizes the importance of administrative leadership in providing stability to the local school and community. It is not the intent of this procedure to establish set maximum time limits for assignments of administrators.

B. Background. Subsequent to the board adoption of the rotation policy, a committee of teachers, administrators, and district staff was convened by the Superintendent to develop guidelines for implementing the rotation policy. A position statement developed by the Grossmont Administrators' Association was adopted by this committee as a guideline statement. That statement is the essence of this procedure.

C. Personnel Affected. Rotation of assignments is applicable to all levels of administrative staff with the following exceptions:

1. Personnel who occupy positions requiring highly specialized areas of concentration, such as associate or assistant superintendents.
2. ndividuals having insufficient career longevity to make a meaningful contribution to a new position.

D. Rationale.

1. To assure a positive effect from rotation, a district commitment will be made to establish objective management evaluation procedures. Such an evaluation will involve both peer and self evaluation. Validity in rotation actions will be directly equated to the sophistication of the evaluation process developed and utilized by this district.
2. Decision for the rotation of personnel will give prime consideration to the needs of the students in the communities involved. Wherever possible, consideration will be given to the special competencies required of individuals involved, special programs in progress, and the overall needs of the Grossmont Union High School District.
3. The rotation of personnel will be considered primarily a lateral movement by position. Temporary assignment of an employee to a position is not a matter of rotation.
4. Rotation is assumed to be a positive personnel action which provides professional growth for the individuals involved.
5. The Grossmont Administrators' Association will be involved with the development of procedure concerning rotation in a manner consistent with other decision-making processes utilized by the district administration in personnel matters.
6. The rotation of personnel will occur as needed but not as a required annual or semi-annual process.

E. Rotation Guidelines.

1. To assure reasonable stability and the implementation of long term plans, administrators should normally be allowed a minimum of five years in a position prior to consideration for rotation.
2. Persons selected for rotation from one school to another should, if possible, be notified by March 15 of any school year. With such notification, the individuals concerned should become involved with cooperative planning during the second semester with those persons to be replaced. In the case of principal rotation, such cooperative planning will be encouraged in the area of budget and personnel for the ensuing school year.
3. Persons rotating will assume their new positions as of July 1, and individuals involved will be given the option of one month of employment prior to September 1, for orientation and planning purposes.
4. Every effort will be made to continually evaluate the rotational process with input from all levels, including the Grossmont Administrators' Association but with the understanding that the final decision in rotation matters rests with the superintendent and the Governing Board of the Grossmont Union High School District.

(Continued)

5. Potential assignments at principal-level positions will reasonably fall into the following categories:

   a. Assumption of a district-level position
   b. Acceptance of a new position
   c. Assignment to another school
   d. A one-year inservice experience (shorter assignment by mutual agreement)

6. Principal-level reassignments may be initiated by the principal or superintendent. Assignments will be mutually agreed upon and approved by the Governing Board.

7. Reassignment at the vice principal level will normally occur as rotation to another site. A request for rotation can be initiated by the vice principal, principal, and/or the assistant superintendent, personnel. Final assignments will be mutually agreed upon by all parties involved, with the final approval of the superintendent and Governing Board. Under certain circumstances, reassignment of vice principal level positions may provide an opportunity for experience at the district level.

8. This procedure shall not preclude the transfer of personnel as currently provided by the District Procedure #2121 in order to meet the personnel needs of the Grossmont Union High School District.

-- Grossmont Union High School District, California

EX2 BOARD POLICY: Rotation of Administrative Assignments

The Board of Education encourages the rotation of administrative assignments for the professional improvement of personnel, as well as the good of the school district, at least once every three to five years.

-- Willingboro, New Jersey

EX3 BOARD POLICY: Transfer of Principals

The Board of Education of the Baldwin Park Unified School District firmly believes that a periodic change in building administrators is educationally sound in that it provides the opportunity for self-renewal for the administrator and the staff. Therefore, the following guidelines are hereby adopted to help the administration implement this policy.

I. Principals shall be subject to transfer at the completion of their fifth year in any one assignment.

II. Principals who remain in one assignment longer than five years should be transferred not later than the completion of their seventh year.

III. Nothing in this policy shall prohibit the superintendent from transferring principals at any time when in his judgment it is in the best interest of the school district to do so.

-- Baldwin Park, California

EX4 BOARD POLICY: Assignments and Appointments--Certificated Personnel

The Superintendent is to make provision for the orderly transfer of administrators in a manner that will provide reasonable continuity of administrative leadership and the stimulation derived from change at regular intervals.

-- Whittier Union High School District, California

EX5

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION: Assignment and Transfer of Principals

The Clark County School District Administration, with the approval of the Board of School Trustees, has the sole authority to assign principals and assistant principals to school positions. Assignments and transfers are made on the basis of what is considered to be in the best interests of the students to be served. Secondary considerations are the desires and interests of principals.

The following are guidelines and expectations of principals relative to assignment:

1. Periodic rotation or transfer of principals is considered to be of positive value to the educational welfare of students and the professional growth of principals.

2. No principal should accept a position with an expectation of serving less than two years in that position.

3. Principals should not expect to remain in the same school indefinitely and normally would be expected to request rotation to another school after five to seven years as principal in a given school.

Geographical location or special circumstances concerning a school may warrant exceptions to these guidelines or a temporary transfer to a different responsibility.

-- Clark County, Nevada

Prepared by Suzanne K. Stemnock,
Educational Research Service, Inc.

Price: $2.00 ($1.00 for ERS members)

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, INC., is a nonprofit corporation established and sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, and National School Public Relations Association.

ERS subscriptions are available to local school systems, regional service agencies, state departments of education, state and local associations of school administrators, university departments of school administration, and related organizations interested in school administration and supervision. Subscription rates are available upon request.

In serving the information and research needs of its subscribers, ERS publishes nine series of documents, including the *ERS Information Aid*. An *Information Aid* is a summary of information (not necessarily research-based) relating to a specific topic and is restricted by copyright from reproduction in whole or in part without specific written permission. ERS is solely responsible for the contents of its publications; no endorsement by any of ERS' sponsoring organizations is either inferred or implied. Correspondence may be addressed to Glen Robinson, Executive Vice President/Director of Research, or to Dale Gaddy, Assistant Director, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, INC., 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22209 (phone: 703/527-5331).